(SQ – 10) Water Erosion Management Considerations (Assessment Guide)

		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	atti Li	USIUII IV.	ramagen	пспе	Complact	ation	b (11bbc	ssincin Guide)					
		Irr. Range (cb)		Inches Applied  1.0   2.0   3.0				Infiltration Assessment (Water Quality)								7
Soil	Avail. Water		Soils					SAR	Degree of Restriction on Use (ECiw in				iw in dS/m)		Ţ	it.
Texture	(in./ft.)		Intake					SAIL	None Slight to Mod		<u> </u>			(K Factor)	Soil Erodibility <sup>1/</sup>	
	(=========		Family	Infili	tration '	Time									ĕ	po.
Sands	0.5			(Hrs)				0 - 3	> 0.7		0.7 - 0.2		< 0.2			豆
Loamy			0.1	2.8	10.5	22.3		3 - 6	> 1.2		1.2 - 0.3		< 0.3			į
Sands	1.0			1.0										4		<u> </u>
Fine Sands		30-40	0.3	1.0 3.5		6.8		6 - 12	> 1.9		1.9 – 0.5		< 0.5		7	>
V. F. Sands			0.5	0.63	2.0	3.8		12-20	> 2.9		2.9 – 1.3 5.0 – 2.9		< 1.3			Erodibility
L. F. Sands	1.25		0.75	0.48	1.5	2.8	20-40		>	5.0			< 2.9		Clay .1 – 0	dib
Loamy Very			1.0	0.33	1.0	1.8		SAR = 4	SAR = 4, $ECiw = 1.1 dS/m$			m (restriction on use: slight)			CI 0.1	ŗ
Fine Sands					0.0			•	,						S	≽I
Sandy Loam		40.70	1.25	0.28	0.8	1.5	- <u>L</u>						ydrologic		und - 0.15	Low
Fine Sandy Loam	1.5	40-50						Soil		Downward		S	Soil Group		Sand 05 – 0	Ţ
			1.5	0.23 0.7		1.3		Structu	ıre	movement of H <sub>2</sub> O		(HSG) <u>Undrained soils</u>			Sa 0.05	
Very Fine			1.75	0.20	0.6	1.1		Single Grai							0.0	
Sandy Loam		50-60	1.73	1.75				Single Grain		Rapid		. 3				
	2.0		0.6 Intake; 2.5" applied and					Granular		c			ntial Lowest		n 35	İ
Loam			2.6 hrs. to infiltrate				L					Runoff Potential			оаг 0.	
Silt Loam							<u> </u>	Blocky	<u> </u>						Silt Loam 0.25 – 0.35	<b>1</b> 5
Silt				: Irrigation System –				Prismatic		Moderate		$\mathbf{C}$	# H		Silt 2.2	þ
Sandy Clay Loam		60-70	Graded Border Program:  INPUTS:  CFS = 7.5  Net application depth (2")  % field slope (0.001'/ft.)					Platy  Massive		Slow						High Erodibility-
Silty	2.2						-						Run		Silt .4 - 0.6	Εr
Clay Loam												D \ \alpha \ \frac{1}{12}			Silt 1 - 0	딮
Clay Loam								Soil is Granular (Ra			(Rapid)		田		δ 4.	H
Sandy Clay	2.0		Soil Intake (0.6 )										soil group		0.	
Silty Clay	2.0	70-80	• Manning's (n = .15)				Exa	Example Assessment: Irrigated with Hi-Flow Turn Out  Soil: Silt Loam  HSG is B and has a							.253	<b>35</b>
Clay		<ul> <li>Field Width (436')</li> <li>Field Length (600')</li> </ul>									nd has a nfiltration					
Silt Loam:			• Field Length (600')					SAR is 4 & ECiw is 1.1 rate				crate II	e in initiation			
Irrigated at 55 cb			RESULTS:					Slight restriction on use > Soil S					ructure: Granular			
IIIIgateu at 33 CD			Appl. Efficiency (81%)									ff is 0.11"		Rudy Garcia		
	• Runoff = 0.11"					potential is moderate to high			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<mark>(erosion is <u>not</u> observed)</mark>			2008			
1/ Clay is resi	stant to	detachmen	t (low erodi	hility po	tential)	Sand is	easil		d (low	erodihi	lity potential du		rge dense na	rtic	cles) Silt	

1/ <u>Clay</u> is resistant to detachment (low erodibility potential). <u>Sand</u> is easily detached (low erodibility potential due to large dense particles). <u>Silt</u> <u>Loam</u> is moderately detachable (moderate to high erodibility potential). <u>Silt</u> is easily detached (high erodibility potential; is easily transported).